



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

(342 ff.) to Philinos when *κεκτημένη* 146 (343) and *ὁ τρόφιμος* 149 (345) point clearly to a slave as the speaker, and that slave apparently Daos.

Attempts to fill the larger gaps in the lines of the fragments seldom serve any more valuable purpose than to indicate an editor's understanding of the action. Robert's *δέκα τάλαντα* in the mutilated passage, *Περικερομένη* 166 ff. (363 ff.), receives no confirmation from Körte's readings. There is, on the whole, more profitable work to be found in using what we have than in stopping gaps, however ingeniously, with phrases that simply represent presuppositions as to the plot of the play.

It is inevitable, however, that this fragmentary literature should tempt the imagination, and here and there the editor's intuition may have led him to the right issue. In matters archaeological Robert is an acknowledged authority, and we look forward with interest to the elaboration of his discovery that three plays of the Cairo papyrus are illustrated in three scenes from a frieze of the *Casa del centennaio* ("Mon. d. Inst. XI, tav. xxx-xxxii").

The translation is of interest to scholars only in so far as it serves to interpret the text. The text, however, represents the editor's later views, and in many respects deviates from the interpretation offered in the translation. These deviations are noted on the last page of the edition of the text.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Catulli Veronensis Liber. Erklaert von GUSTAV FRIEDRICH.
Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. Pp. 560. M. 12.

This latest addition to Teubner's *Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare* contains a text of Catullus as well as a commentary upon it. No *apparatus criticus* is appended, but many readings are discussed critically in the notes. The principles on which the editor has constituted the text are set forth in a brief preface. He believes, with K. P. Schulze, that O and G are both direct copies of the lost Veronensis, and preserve the best tradition of the text; but the corrections of G (g), and the remaining MSS, go back to a third (lost) copy of Veronensis, and yet a fourth is represented by Datanus. The Venice MS published in facsimile by Costantino Nigra is, however, according to Friedrich, of no such marked value as Schulze attributed to it, being, indeed, no better than the common ruck of MSS other than OGD. But even so it is better, declares the editor, than the codex Romanus of Professor Hale, which furnishes not a thing for the constitution of the text. He even challenges Professor Hale to produce a single passage of Catullus bettered *einwandsfrei* by the aid of codex R. It may be remarked in passing that it appears to be a somewhat curious critical standpoint

that the editor thus occupies, and might well awaken some preliminary distrust of the soundness of his critical sense. This may be said without any attempt to adjudicate upon the question of the precise character of R. For, according to the *pronunciamento* of Herr Friedrich, even the discovery of the lost Veronensis itself would probably be an event of no real importance, as all the readings of V are very possibly included in one or another of its extant descendants, or may be inferred from their readings. Does Herr Friedrich really think it just as convincing to determine the proper text of an author by his own cerebration working upon little evidence, as to determine it by the consideration of much, and immediately pertinent, evidence? It may further be remarked that Friedrich apparently professes to base his judgment of the extremely low value of R upon his own examination of that codex in Rome. Yet he does not distinguish in, for example, one important case (49. 7) between the first hand of R and a much later interlinear correction. Does Herr Friedrich really think that it makes no difference in the judgment of a MS reading whether it is part of the main text or a correction introduced, it may be, a century later? But here, and elsewhere, despite his professed basis of personal examination, he may be merely copying readings from the edition of Professor Ellis in the Oxford series.

The editor's style has a breeziness and vigor, as well as a quality of clarity, that makes it good reading. But his treatment of critical problems is too often characterized by unsafe methods. One example out of many may suffice. In 47. 2 he would emend the MSS *scabies famesque mundi* to read *scabies famesque saecli*, on the ground that Catullus could not have used *mundus* in this sense, Horace being probably the very first to do that (in *Sat. i. 3. 112*). This is a sufficiently striking *petitio principii!* The paleographical defense for his emendation by Herr Friedrich is of course that *mundi* was an interlinear gloss upon *saecli*, which it later displaced. This is a form of explanation of paleographical difficulties which the editor especially affects. He brings it in even on the most innocent occasions, as, for example, in 61. 186, where *unis* might have been most simply and satisfactorily explained as a mere error of the eye for *uiris*. The trouble with Herr Friedrich's remedy is that, like many other medicines, it needs to be used with caution and self-command. It is a form of explanation that may otherwise explain too much. It may be used to afford a purely fictitious support to the wildest and most unnecessary of conjectures.

The liveliness of Herr Friedrich's imagination and the facility of his pen lead him not infrequently into an exuberance of idea and of verbiage that appear somewhat removed from the staid dignity of a "wissenschaftlicher Kommentar," though they add to the agreeableness of his style—but at the expense sometimes of a carefully reasoned conclusion. One trait in the book deserves unqualified condemnation—the pornic taste

that expresses itself on certain occasions in dash and innuendo. It is far more disgusting than anything in Catullus himself.

On the whole, the book, though rather too disdainfully self-confident in manner, and inferior in real solidity of grounding to some other treatises of the series in which it is issued, will have to be taken seriously into consideration by future editors of Catullus.

E. T. M.

Q. Horati Flacci Carmina. Recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Editio Maior. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1907. Pp. viii + 390. M. 2.

Briefly in the preface of this book and at greater length in an article in *Philologus*, Supplementband X, pp. 261-322, "Die Überlieferungsgeschichte des Horaz," Professor Vollmer has stated the principles upon which he has based his edition. His theory is expounded in a clear and interesting way, and in innumerable details shows erudition and long and careful thought. The results of the whole investigation, however, are disappointing. Many important conclusions are based on hypotheses which are not adequately supported by the evidence, and while it is patent that the classification of the MSS given by Keller and Holder is open to serious criticism, it is doubtful whether Vollmer has proved himself a safer guide.

Instead of the threefold classification of Keller and Holder, Vollmer sets up a twofold classification. According to him all the MSS of Horace are derived from one or the other of two copies made in the eighth century from the text which Mavortius emended in the sixth century; Mavortius' text was derived from Porphyrio's edition, which in its turn went back to an edition by the grammarian Probus of the first century.

The weakness of this stemma is obvious. Vollmer has wholly failed to establish any connection between Porphyrio and Probus. Moreover, he has not proved that Probus made an edition of Horace. There are no traces of such an edition, nor does Probus' name even appear in the scholia of Horace. But the most surprising feature of the whole stemma is the assumption that all the MSS are derived from copies of the very MS which Mavortius emended and which, Vollmer thinks, survived till the eighth century. It is true that the period from the sixth to the eighth century showed a vastly diminished interest in the copying of MSS, but it is not safe to assume from the absence of direct testimony that Horace was wholly neglected and that his works were neither read nor copied.

The two copies of the MS of Mavortius from which all our codices are derived showed differences, according to our editor, along these lines: the order of the poems, the errors of the scribes, and finally the scholia and glosses. In determining whether a given MS belongs to his class